Remarks

After entry of the subject Amendment, claims 1, 3-10, 12, 14-47, and 68-75 will remain in the application with claims 1 and 19 being in independent form. Claims 1 and 19 have been amended and claims 68-75 have been added.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 19-21, 27, 36, 37, 41, 42, and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Antonov (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,046) in view of Stephens et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,261,103). Claims 4, 7, 9-10, 12, 14-18, 22-26, 28-35, 38-40, and 43-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Antonov in view of Stephens et al. in further view of various other references and an Official Notice.

As noted by the Examiner in the second paragraph under the Response to Arguments section;

> the Examiner would like to note that an interview would likely expedite prosecution of the present application. It appears that there is unclaimed subject matter in the present application that would be sufficient to overcome the prior art of record and potentially place the application in condition for allowance. Applicant is encouraged to contact the Examiner to schedule an interview. . .

Applicant sincerely appreciates the invitation for an interview and through such invitation conducted an interview with the Examiner on May 16, 2007. As stated in the attached Interview Summary, the Examiner identified potential patentability in the indexer and the process of passing the signal through the hub without modification. Also, the send-only/send-and-forget system, which eliminates duplicate data and does not require requests for the data, was identified as being potentially patentable.

Applicant has therefore amended the independent claims to clarify the novelty of the subject invention as identified by the Examiner and otherwise distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record. Specifically, these claims now require the limitation that *the instantaneous values are sent without the values being requested*. In other words, when node 1 sends a value to node 2, node 2 has not requested this value. Node 1 is preprogrammed, through the pointers, to automatically send the values to node 2 at an

appropriate time without a request. The independent claims were also amended to clarify that the instantaneous values are not stored in the first node (sending node) *to eliminate any unnecessary duplication of stored data.* This further clarifies the send-only/send-and-forget system of the subject invention. The independent claims were further amended to clarify that the instantaneous values are not modified, *stored, or requested* when being sent from the hub.

The prior art of record does not disclose or teach of this unique and non-obvious system. Accordingly, Applicant contends that independent claims 1 and 19, as amended, are distinguished over Antonov in combination with Stephens et al., as well as the other prior art of record, such that the rejections of these claims is believed overcome. The remaining claims depend from the unique features of claims 1 or 19 such that these claims are also distinguished over the prior art of record.

It is noted that the Examiner has set forth numerous rejections of the dependent claims. Applicant does not concur with each of these rejections. However, in light of the amendments to the independent claims, Applicant believes that addressing each of these rejections is, at this time, unnecessary.

Regarding the newly added dependent claims, these claims set forth additional unique and non-obvious features of the subject invention as identified by the Examiner. Specifically, claims 68 and 69 further define the indexer and claims 70 and 71 further define the timing of when the values are stored in the addressed node. Claims 72-75 further define the send-only system in that only the addressed node can retrieve and process the stored instantaneous value in the real memory location of the addressed node. In other words, the other nodes in the system cannot request, retrieve, or access the stored instantaneous value of the addressed node.

It is respectfully submitted that the Application, as amended, is now presented in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully solicited.   The Commissioner is authorized to charge our Deposit Account No. 08-2789, in the name of Howard & Howard Attorneys, P.C. for any fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C.

Dated: June 6, 2007   **/SAMUEL J. HAIDLE/**
                              Samuel J. Haidle, Registration No. 42,619
                              The Pinehurst Office Center, Suite 101
                              39400 Woodward Avenue
                              Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304-5151
                              (248) 723-0334

#273015v1-Amendment.doc